

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

DARRYL MCGORE,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 2:18-cv-39

v.

Honorable Gordon J. Quist

UNKNOWN PARTIES et al.,

Defendants.

**OPINION DENYING LEAVE
TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS - THREE STRIKES**

This is a civil rights action brought by a state prisoner under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff seeks leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Because Plaintiff has filed at least three lawsuits that were dismissed as frivolous, malicious or for failure to state a claim, he is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The Court will order Plaintiff to pay the \$400.00 civil action filing fee applicable to those not permitted to proceed *in forma pauperis*. This fee must be paid within twenty-eight (28) days of this opinion and accompanying order. If Plaintiff fails to pay the fee, the Court will order that this case be dismissed without prejudice. Even if the case is dismissed, Plaintiff must pay the \$400.00 filing fee in accordance with *In re Alea*, 286 F.3d 378, 380-81 (6th Cir. 2002).

Discussion

The Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996), which was enacted on April 26, 1996, amended the procedural rules governing a prisoner's request for the privilege of proceeding *in forma pauperis*. As the Sixth Circuit has stated, the PLRA was "aimed at the skyrocketing numbers of claims filed by prisoners—many of which are

meritless—and the corresponding burden those filings have placed on the federal courts.” *Hampton v. Hobbs*, 106 F.3d 1281, 1286 (6th Cir. 1997). For that reason, Congress created economic incentives to prompt a prisoner to “stop and think” before filing a complaint. *Id.* For example, a prisoner is liable for the civil action filing fee, and if the prisoner qualifies to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the prisoner may pay the fee through partial payments as outlined in 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). The constitutionality of the fee requirements of the PLRA has been upheld by the Sixth Circuit. *Id.* at 1288.

In addition, another provision reinforces the “stop and think” aspect of the PLRA by preventing a prisoner from proceeding *in forma pauperis* when the prisoner repeatedly files meritless lawsuits. Known as the “three-strikes” rule, the provision states:

In no event shall a prisoner bring a civil action or appeal a judgment in a civil action or proceeding under [the section governing proceedings *in forma pauperis*] if the prisoner has, on 3 or more prior occasions, while incarcerated or detained in any facility, brought an action or appeal in a court of the United States that was dismissed on the grounds that it is frivolous, malicious, or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted, unless the prisoner is under imminent danger of serious physical injury.

28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). The statutory restriction “[i]n no event,” found in § 1915(g), is express and unequivocal. The statute does allow an exception for a prisoner who is “under imminent danger of serious physical injury.” The Sixth Circuit has upheld the constitutionality of the three-strikes rule against arguments that it violates equal protection, the right of access to the courts, and due process, and that it constitutes a bill of attainder and is *ex post facto* legislation. *Wilson v. Yaklich*, 148 F.3d 596, 604-06 (6th Cir. 1998).

Plaintiff has been an active litigant in the federal courts in Michigan. In eight of his cases, all of his claims were dismissed because they were frivolous, malicious or failed to state a claim. See *Gresham v. Caruso et al.*, No. 2:10-cv-196 (W.D. Mich. Oct. 27, 2011); *Gresham et al. v. Canlis et al.*, No. 2:11-cv-179 (W.D. Mich. July 29, 2011); *Gresham v. Paine et al.*, No.

1:10-cv-1146 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 8, 2011); *Gresham v. Caruso et al.*, No. 1:10-cv-1038 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 26, 2011); *Gresham v. Wolak et al.*, No. 2:10-cv- 239 (W.D. Mich. July 25, 2011); *Gresham v. Verville et al.*, No. 2:10-cv-198 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 19, 2011); *Gresham v. Caruso et al.*, No. 2:10-cv-195 (W.D. Mich. Apr. 11, 2011); *Gresham v. Mich. Dep't of Corr. et al.*, No. 2:07-cv-241 (W.D. Mich. June 9, 2008). Plaintiff also has been denied leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in numerous cases. See *Gresham v. Miniard et al.*, No. 1:16-cv-427 (W.D. Mich. June 7, 2016); *Gresham v. Christiansen et al.*, No. 1:16-cv-428 (W.D. Mich. May 13, 2016); *Gresham v. Austin et al.*, 2:16-cv-71 (W.D. Mich. May 2, 2016); *Gresham et al. v. Yunker et al.*, No. 2:13-cv-221 (W.D. Mich. Aug. 29, 2013); *Gresham v. Nader et al.*, 2:13-cv-212 (W.D. Mich. July 22, 2013); *Gresham et al. v. Napel et al.*, No. 2:13-cv-176 (W.D. Mich. June 12, 2013); *Gresham v. Prelesnik et al.*, No. 1:12-cv-276 (W.D. Mich. July 2, 2012); *Gresham v. Czop et al.*, No. 1:12-cv-494 (W.D. Mich. June 18, 2012); *Gresham v. Heyns et al.*, No. 1:12-cv-277 (W.D. Mich. Apr. 11, 2012); *Gresham v. Snyder et al.*, No. 1:12-cv-143 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 6, 2012); *Gresham v. Mutschler et al.*, No. 2:12-cv-12 (W.D. Mich. Apr. 20, 2012); *Gresham v. Snyder et al.*, No. 2:12-cv-22 (W.D. Mich. Mar. 30, 2012); *Gresham v. Mutschler et al.*, No. 2:12-cv-9 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 10, 2012); *Gresham v. Snyder et al.*, No. 2:12-cv-5 (W.D. Mich. Jan. 27, 2012); *Gresham v. Violetta et al.*, No. 2:12-cv-24 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 6, 2012); *Gresham v. Dahl et al.*, No. 2:12-cv-21 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 6, 2012); *Gresham v. Napel et al.*, No. 2:11-cv-520 (W.D. Mich. Feb. 6, 2012); *Gresham v. LaChance et al.*, No. 2:11-cv-231 (W.D. Mich. June 24, 2011); *Dennis et al v. Canlis et al.*, No. 2:11-cv-186 (W.D. Mich. June 6, 2011).

Moreover, Plaintiff's allegations do not fall within the "imminent danger" exception to the three-strikes rule. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g). Plaintiff's complaint asserts claims

against members of the Michigan Parole Board regarding the frequency of his review hearings. Plaintiff does not allege facts showing that he is in imminent danger of serious physical injury.

Therefore, § 1915(g) prohibits Plaintiff from proceeding *in forma pauperis* in this action. Plaintiff has twenty-eight (28) days from the date of entry of this order to pay the entire civil action filing fee, which is \$400.00. When Plaintiff pays his filing fee, the Court will screen his complaint as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and 42 U.S.C. § 1997e(c). If Plaintiff does not pay the filing fee within the 28-day period, this case will be dismissed without prejudice, but Plaintiff will continue to be responsible for payment of the \$400.00 filing fee.

Dated: June 28, 2018

/s/ Gordon J. Quist
GORDON J. QUIST
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

SEND REMITTANCES TO THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS:

Clerk, U.S. District Court
399 Federal Building
110 Michigan Street, NW
Grand Rapids, MI 49503

All checks or other forms of payment shall be payable to “Clerk, U.S. District Court.”